

Sherman 2001-0025

#### R E M A R K S

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 12 is amended herein to overcome the rejection.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,963,549 ('549 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Examiner asserts that the cited reference teaches the subject matter defined by claim 1, and in support of the assertion the Examiner points to col. 3, lines 31-44, and to col. 5, lines 5-29 of the reference. It is respectfully submitted that the cited passages do not support the Examiner's assertion.

The reference teaches a method whereby a medium is reserved for the transmission of information. The reservation is effected with a central authority sending a message that specifies a reserved time value which is based on the requested time and on the "available resources" (col. 5, lines 10). No spoofing whatsoever takes place. The effort by the central authority is to offer to a requesting station as much of the medium's time as is requests, given the constraints presented by the needs of other stations; and if anything, the duration granted to the requesting station may be smaller than what is requested. Accordingly, at the end of the reserved time interval the central authority sends a refresh notice. When the station does not respond to the refresh notice, the medium is released to other requesting stations.

In contradistinction, claim 1 is directed to spoofing of stations. That is, stations are fooled into believing that the terminal that reserves a span of time intends to transmit during that time where, in fact, it does not intend to do so. Thus, claim 1 specifies a method for spoofing stations. Further, claim 1 (prior to its amendment) specified a step of setting a duration value to a value **other than** a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission; and that is how the spoofing is effected. Since the reference does not teach spoofing at all, it follows that claim 1 is not anticipated by the reference.

Further still, claim 1 is amended to specify that the value that is set is not only different from a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission but is **greater than** a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission. This

Sherman 2001-0025

is clearly not what the reference teaches or suggests. Therefore, amended claim 1 is even more clearly not anticipated by the reference.

Claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 6,965,942 ('942 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses. Since the '942 patent does not teach spoofing, and is not even offered for such teaching, it does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above. Therefore, the combination of the '549 and the '942 patents does not result in the method defined by claims 3, 4, 8 and 9, nor does it result in a method that makes the method defined in claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 obvious.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of the '942 patent and further in view of US Patent 6,622,521 ('521 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses. The '521 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches group addressing. Adding the '521 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, '942, and '521 patents does not render claims 5 and 10 obvious.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 5,557,745 ('745 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses. The '745 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches group addressing or multicasting. Adding the '745 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '745 patents does not render claim 18 obvious.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 5,721,725 ('725 patent). The '725 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches the problem of hidden stations not being aware of medium reservation. Adding the '725 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '725 patents does not render claim 19 obvious.

Sherman 2001-0025

Claims 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 6,920,171 ('171 patent). The '171 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches the notion of lower priority devices deliberately limiting their transmissions, thereby increasing the likelihood of information from higher priority devices getting through. Adding the '171 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '171 patents does not render claims 10 and 22 obvious.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 6,754,176 ('176 patent). The '176 patent does not teach spoofing, and it is not asserted that it does; but rather it is cited for the proposition that it teaches overlapping basic service sets. Adding the '176 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '176 patents does not render claim 21 obvious.

Claims 6, 7, 11, and 13-17 were objected for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were deemed allowable otherwise. In view of the above arguments, which demonstrate that the base claims should be allowed, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all of the objections and rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,  
Matthew J. Sherman

Dated: 5/25/06

By Henry T. Brendzel  
Henry T. Brendzel  
Reg. No. 26,844  
Phone (973) 467-2025  
Fax (973) 467-6589  
email brendzel@comcast.net